New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Richard H. Waldo, Secretary; F. A. Sofer, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo.	$ .75	Daily only, 1 month	$ .50
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos.	4.25	Daily only, 6 months	3.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 year	8.50	Daily only, 1 year	6.00
Sunday only, 6 months	1.25	Sunday only, 1 year	2.50

FOREIGN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY		CANADIAN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY	
One month	$1.50	One month	$ .75
One year	17.00	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	2.25	One month	.50
One year	6.00	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.25	One month	.50
One year	15.00	One year	4.50

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

"Undiluted Americanism."

We have received several letters expressing a sentiment of which the following is entirely illustrative:

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Do you now believe that the German-Americans control American politics?

We told you long ago that our candidate would be nominated at the Chicago convention, and he proved to be the unanimous choice.

Mr. Roosevelt was the most offensive to us, and we proceeded to put the kibosh on him and to force him out of politics.

The man next most offensive to us is Mr. Woodrow Wilson. We now are able to deal with him in his turn.

We shall use your paper and Mr. Roosevelt to put him where he belongs and to elect our candidate, who is wise enough not to offend the Hyphenates, and in his acceptance statement was careful to avoid all reference to the European situation.

V. ADOLPH ACKERMANN.

New Haven, Conn., June 12, 1916.

The Tribune reprints this letter because we think it serves better than any words of our own to demonstrate the situation that now exists, and the situation which will continue to exist until Mr. Hughes once and for all meets it squarely.

The trouble with such a statement as Mr. Hughes made yesterday pledging himself to "out and out" Americanism lies in the fact that it is precisely the sort of statement that has been coming from German-American sources from the very beginning of the European war. The German-Americans who cheered the sinking of the Lusitania with equal eagerness proclaimed themselves loyal Americans and denounced the lack of patriotism of the women and children who got in the way of the German submarine.

This newspaper is not trying to embarrass Mr. Hughes. It wants to see him elected. It is anxious to do all that it can to contribute to his victory. It believes that when Mr. Hughes says he stands for an "undiluted Americanism" he means that his policy on the Hyphen question is our policy.

But unfortunately this view will not be sufficiently widely held. Mr. Hughes has made no declaration on the matter of Americanism that Mr. Wilson has not made a score of times. In fact, Mr. Wilson's utterances have been far more specific and definite than Mr. Hughes's and have earned him opposition and denunciation.

This newspaper has supported Mr. Hughes in all his campaigns for public office. In declaring for Colonel Roosevelt it said frankly that it should have preferred to support Mr. Hughes if he had consented to make a public statement of his views on the pending questions.

When Mr. Hughes was nominated it pledged its support, and its loyal support, to him. It may be that The Tribune is wholly mistaken in its view of American sentiment and American purposes. If it is Mr. Hughes can well afford to ignore what we have said and pay no heed to any advice we may give.

It is a very simple thing for Mr. Hughes, taking his cue from his friends of "The Evening Post," who admire him almost as much as they hate Colonel Roosevelt, to seek every opportunity to emphasize the difference between Roosevelt and himself, even when this necessitates confessing likeness to Mr. Wilson. But Colonel Roosevelt can help Mr. Hughes far more than "The Evening Post."

The Tribune recognizes clearly that the decision rests with Mr. Hughes. It understands perfectly that it is for Mr. Hughes to decide whether he prefers the help of those have stood with Mr. Roosevelt in his last great battle or is content to take the Hyphen support. But The Tribune is satisfied that he cannot have both. It is for his advisers to say in which direction the ultimate profit lies and for him to decide.

Mr. Hughes will be mistaken if he believes that the fact that The Tribune supported another candidate in the convention now influences its course. It is a simple and an easy thing, once a party has nominated, for a newspaper belonging to that party to fall in behind the band and acclaim the platform the supreme triumph of genius and patriotism and to applaud every act and every failure to act on the part of the candidate as an indication of inspiration.

The Tribune cannot follow such a course. Despite all that was said at the time it did not criticise Mr. Wilson's foreign policy as a Republican newspaper. It did not seek to make partisan profit out of the difficulties and perils of that time. It supported Mr. Wilson without hesitation up to the moment in which it became convinced that he was not following an honorable or a patriotic course. Then it left him.

To-day The Tribune cannot be false to what it has said. It cannot pretend that the Republican platform is strong when it contains precisely the same evasions and weaknesses that have been revealed in all Mr. Wilson's utterances and actions. It cannot pretend that generalities spoken by Mr. Hughes are different from generalities spoken by Mr. Wilson. We have come to the precise point where we must either be a party organ, without regard to principles we professed for long months before the campaign, or tell the truth as we see it. In so far as we are able we mean to tell the truth.

Many, many months ago this newspaper said:

> It would be better for the Republican party to indorse Woodrow Wilson in 1916 than to permit the principle to be established that to defend American interests is to commit political suicide.

The Tribune meant that on July 16, 1915, and it means it on June 14, 1916. It believes now as it believed then that if the German-American interests are identified with any candidate, that candidate will be defeated by Americans, without regard to party. Only Mr. Hughes can decide whether his candidacy shall have this label, and only he can prevent it.

Indianapolis, Stamping Ground of Vice-Presidents.

If Congress were to decide to furnish the Vice-President with an official residence, a very good argument could be put up for buying a site in Indianapolis rather than Washington. The Hoosier capital has harbored more Vice-Presidents and Vice-Presidential candidates than any other city in the United States. She is first and the rest are nowhere. The present Vice-President, who now seems assured of a renomination by his own party, stepped across the street in Indianapolis last Saturday to congratulate the Vice-Presidential candidate just nominated by the opposition party at Chicago. The Vice-Presidential contest will be a neighborly affair in the Hoosier metropolis this year. Whichever ticket wins, there will be no change in the postoffice address of the Presidential heir-apparent.

More than any other state except New York, Indiana has been favored by the political equilibrium established in the nation at the close of the Civil War. The solidification of the South had made it possible for the Democratic party to concentrate all its efforts in Presidential years on the capture of a few Northern states. New York, New Jersey, Indiana and Connecticut used to constitute the old "doubtful" Northern group. Connecticut and New Jersey outgrew that association. But in normal years, 1896 and 1900 being abnormal ones, national conventions have generally apportioned at least one place on the ticket to New York or to Indiana. Having the smaller vote, Indiana has usually drawn the Vice-Presidential nomination. But in 1888 and 1892 she had a Presidential candidate in the person of Benjamin Harrison.

Since the war Indiana's Vice-Presidential nominees have been: Schuyler A. Colfax, in 1868; Thomas A. Hendricks, in 1876; William H. English, in 1880; Thomas A. Hendricks, in 1884; Charles W. Fairbanks, in 1904; John W. Kern, in 1908; Thomas R. Marshall, in 1912; Charles W. Fairbanks and, presumably, Thomas R. Marshall also, in 1916. And all these candidates at the time of their nomination, except Colfax, were residents of Indianapolis.

No other community in the country can produce a record approaching this. Some other city may eventually wrest from Indianapolis her proud supremacy as the literary centre of North America. But none can ever hope to contest successfully her eminence as a mother of Vice-Presidents and Vice-Presidential candidates.

The Banner at Daybreak.

There are few Americans who will not awake to Flag Day, 1916, with some touch of quickened spirit. No one can pretend that our plans and aspirations have been clearly remade. As a nation we have still far to travel before the horizon of the Great War becomes surveyed and comprehended ground. In large measure the new mind is sheer disturbance and dissatisfaction, revolt against the easygoing past and discontent with the present. It is a vague desire for light and inspiration that is chiefly waking within us.

A dulling of the national conscience was the phrase used by Colonel Roosevelt in his eloquent message to Chicago. That we all feel, as a tendency at the least, forced upon us by our national attitude since August, 1914. Yet the roots of our failure reach beyond that year well into the past. It is the danger of a long period of peace and plenty that a nation, like an individual, begins to think of peace and plenty as the end of existence. A country becomes a lavish provider of good things rather than a mother to die for. Life ceases to be a thing to spend and be spent and turns into a comfortable seat in the sun, to be preserved at all cost.

What is coming into our vision again is the perception that peace is not an end in itself—any more than war. For a country, as for a man or a woman or a child, the one goal is to do right, to be brave and fair and true, and let what will come after. The last years have not been without their generous motives and fine actions. But they have sought chiefly our physical wellbeing and they have ended at our shores. We relied upon a traditional American optimism, an easygoing faith in our isolation, to permit us to blunder on slowly and undisturbed toward the nearer goal. We see now how fanciful this ideal was. The vague trusting internationalism in the background of our minds two years ago lies in scraps of paper. We see that a nation, like an individual, cannot lock its gates and shut its eyes to the actions of its neighbors. Cannot and ought not. Both for our own safety as a free people and also that we may do our share for the civilization of the world we must be ready to throw our peace and comfort to the winds and fight for our faith.

It is a half century since America last saw and lived this truth. And it is good to-day to turn back to the inspiration of those years. Part of them, in actual hospital work, Walt Whitman was, and their imprint is on many of his pages. Perhaps in no other writing does the message of those days—the awakening of the '60s so closely paralleling the awakening of the decade now begun—speak across the years. The "Song of the Banner at Daybreak" might be written of to-day, as the emotions of a nation amazed and doubting begin to stir and seek utterance on the lips of a leader:

> "O banner, not money so precious are you,
> not farm produce you, nor the material good nutriment,
> Nor excellent stores, nor landed on wharves from the ships,
> Not the superb ships with sail power or steam power, fetching and carrying cargoes,
> Nor machinery, vehicles, trade, nor revenues—but you as henceforth I see you,
> Running up out of the night, bringing your cluster of stars (ever enlarging stars),
> Divider of daybreak you, cutting the air, touch'd by the sun, measuring the sky,
> (Passionately seen and yearn'd for by one poor little child,
> While others remain busy or smartly talking, for ever teaching thrift, thrift);
> O you up there! O pennant! where you undulate like a snake hissing so curious,
> Out of reach, an idea only, yet furiously fought for, risking bloody death, loved by me,
> So loved—O you banner leading the day with stars brought from the night!
> Valueless, object of eyes, over all and demanding all—(absolute owner of all)—O banner and pennant!
> I too leave the rest—great as it is, it is nothing—houses, machines are nothing—I see them not,
> I see but you, O warlike pennant! O banner so broad, with stripes, I sing you only,
> Flapping up there in the wind."

The Crime of Playing Ball.

There is nothing especially novel in the stickful of news telling of three boys arrested for playing baseball in a New York City street. They were found guilty and fined $3 each. Their parents were indignant because the sitting magistrate felt compelled by the statute to order finger-prints taken of the criminals. But that is a detail. Legal machinery has a weakness for just such undiscriminating imbecility.

The really important item for every New Yorker is the knowledge that with the city's present playgrounds the crime of playing ball must and does exist. The Bureau of Recreation, Department of Parks, of Manhattan and Richmond boroughs is heading an excellent effort to utilize the present facilities to the utmost this summer. A hundred park playgrounds, including eight recreation piers, seven gymnasiums and twelve swimming pools, are available, and a widespread campaign is under way to persuade children off the streets and into these parks. This is admirable work—the necessary complement of any effort toward more careful truck and motor driving. If the three hundred children now killed every year on the streets of the city are ever to be saved, such coöperation is absolutely necessary.

The broader problem of play in a great city, however, cannot be solved in a summer, or at all with our present facilities. The city has grown strong and mighty with scant thought that it must rear children to be perpetuated. It was apparently necessary that Miss Jane Addams should remind us of play—that it exists and is important in the city as well as the country. Surely, at that, any American boy, though grown a man, can remember back to the days of "one old cat," and fix it in his past as something better than a crime. More playgrounds, play streets and a continuance of the present organization of our playground facilities—the bulk of the task still lies before us, and no interest in subways or schools or Presidents or wars should persuade us to forget it.

The Long Road to Preparedness.

(From The Washington Post.)

More than a year ago announcement was made that a new munition factory would be established at Eddystone, Del. Sufficient orders had been received from Europe to insure capacity operation for a long time to come.

When the ground was broken, a year ago, it was asserted that within three months rifles would be on their way to Europe. This was characteristic American optimism. The same feeling takes voice in the assertion that 1,000,000 men would spring to arms overnight in case the United States were attacked and gives voice likewise to the belief that this country could provision and equip an army without preliminary preparation. Yet with the assurance of ample orders the enormous factory at Eddystone has not yet turned out a single rifle. It is considered a remarkable achievement that those back of the enterprise have erected what is described as the greatest factory under a single roof in all the world and that they have devised methods to conduct this gigantic business, erecting thousands of machines, many of which are of special design, and putting thousands of men to work. There are already 10,000 men on the payroll, and it is expected when the details are completed rifles will be turned out at the rate of 5,000 a day.

But the experience of the company at Eddystone shows the necessity of complete preparedness long in advance of any danger. The manufacture of rifles, for instance, requires 3,000 separate operations on each weapon. In all, each rifle probable is handled 5,000 times before it is finally loaded into the freight car. More than 1,700 tools, of which 30 per cent are of special design, are required in the various stages of manufacture. Aside from obtaining experts to supervise the manufacture, all the labor engaged in manufacturing the rifles must be trained.

The work that is being done by the munitions factories will be an asset to the nation in any of its own future emergencies. There should be no self-delusion, however, about the time that is needed for adequate preparations for war.

GERMAN "HISTORY"

The Great War as Interpreted by Richard von Kralik.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Growing curious about the manner in which history (for Teutonic consumption) was being written, I went to the library and spent many hours with the "Geschichte des Weltkrieges," written by Richard von Kralik and published in Vienna in 1915.

The first volume contains 362 pages of very closely written matter. It goes to the end of 1914 only. The work when completed will not be without pretention to exhaustiveness. It covers many matters with a wealth of detail; for instance, the successive captures of the Emden are described, an abundance of martial and patriotic verse is quoted at great length and the winter clothing of the soldiery is precisely set forth.

What is most remarkable about this work, however, is not so much what is in it as what is left out. It is this matter of omission which I find most suggestive.

After devoting many pages to a description of Serbia's iniquities our author comes to the ultimatum which was presented to Serbia by Austria on the 23d of July, 1914, at 6 p. m., with a request for an answer within forty-eight hours. This ultimatum is reprinted in full, just as are many proclamations, speeches, etc.

Most of us know to-day how Serbia answered Austria's ultimatum. Most of us think the answer was conciliatory in the extreme and framed with a view to maintaining peace. In fact, most of us are largely pro-Ally because of the attitude of the Teutonic powers following immediately upon the answer which Serbia made to Austria.

What does this Teutonic "history" say about Serbia's note?

It omits it altogether!

But the author, of course, had to refer to it and he does so in this wise:

"It is not necessary to reproduce the Serbian note. . . . I confine myself to an abridged reproduction of the Austrian comment thereon, as it sufficiently characterizes the mental attitude and spirit of the Serbian document" (page 76).

Perhaps you will agree with me that there is something most significant about the omission from a Teutonic history of the text of the one document upon which the fate of Europe depended.

As I pass along I note many more omissions which strike me as significant. For instance, the conduct of the German armies passing through Belgium is said to have influenced greatly public opinion in neutral countries.

Dr. von Kralik dismisses the matter in less than a half page, all told. On page 167 he says: "A painful episode arose from the partial destruction of Louvain because its inhabitants had shot at German troops." To which, on page 200, he adds: "Belgium published officially an accusatory statement of the events to which the town of Louvain had been subjected, alleging that not the inhabitants of Louvain but Germans had shot at Germans. This was refuted by the German government. Besides which it came out that not the whole of Louvain had been destroyed, but only one-fifth or one-sixth. Most of the public buildings were saved, notably the beautiful City Hall. St. Peter's Church at least could be restored."

There is one more reference to the subject. On page 201 we read: "American war correspondents met the libels of the pro-British press with the following declaration: 'In order to honor truth, we unanimously declare that as far as we have observed German atrocities did not occur. . . . The discipline of the German troops is excellent; there is no drunkenness.'"

Arson, pillage, sacrilege, murder, rape, hostages—the whole methodical savagery of the German atrocities—all passed by in silence. Could silence be more eloquent?

I do not want to tax your patience with much more from this precious "History." But there is one gem of thought, discovered on page 353, which is worthy of the manifesto of the ninety-three German "intellectuals":

> "It thus became ever clearer that the universal war was but a spiritual struggle between destructive and constructive forces, between Freemasonry in all its forms and ramifications and Christianity in all its forms and ramifications."

The manifestations of the mind fed on German Kultur have ceased to astonish us, but I must admit that the passage just quoted made me smile. But what of those to whom this fantastic "History" will be a text book?

W. C. B.

New York, June 12, 1916.

Colonel Esterhazy.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I read with interest your news item in this morning's paper, "Dreyfus in Command," and note that you mention Colonel Esterhazy as being in hiding, perhaps under an assumed name, or possiby dead.

Shortly after the conclusion of the second Dreyfus trial, when Alfred Dreyfus was honorably acquitted, the report from London was published announcing the suicide of Esterhazy in England, where he had fled. If you will look over your files of those days when the Dreyfus affair made such a sensation I am sure you will find mention of this fact, for I distinctly recollect it, though at the time only a young girl; but being in Europe the entire case stirred my sympathies very deeply, especially as shortly after, with my mother, we met M. Zola, whose name was closely connected with the entire affair.

MAY G. SCHAEFER.

Bedford Park, N. Y., June 12, 1916.

Our Expensive Prosperity.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In your editorial this morning, "Is Our Prosperity Ethical?" you admit the argument that this country is benefited by the European war because of the large exportations of our goods at high prices. There is, however, another side to that. It is true, a few (comparatively few) people are benefited. But, on the other hand, every person in America has to pay an increased price for every article that he consumes. Is there anything that I buy that I do not have to pay more for on account of the war? If there is, I do not know what it is. In this way every individual in America is helping to pay the cost of the war.

Does not this tax, levied on every man, woman and child in this country, more than offset the benefit on our exportations? Is not the supposed benefit a fallacy?

D. W. BARKER.

Brooklyn, June 10, 1916.

Wanted: A Poem.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A few weeks ago there appeared a poem entitled "Verdun," from the pen of the English writer Harold Begbie. I do not find it among my war clippings, and cannot recall where it was seen. It is earnestly desired for a reading before a war benefit meeting, and I cannot supply it. If some Tribune reader will furnish the missing link the favor will be fully appreciated.

FRANK E. BUTTOLPH.

New York, June 12, 1916.

FLAG DAY.

TWO AMERICANS

"Le Temps," of Paris, Contrasts Roosevelt and Wilson and the Two Viewpoints They Represent—One the Champion of International Responsibility, the Other of Caution and Aloofness.

President Wilson and former President Roosevelt have both delivered addresses, fragments of which have just reached us by telegraph.

These addresses, while they may be taken as a preface to the Presidential campaign about to begin, constitute the affirmation of two policies and of two philosophies. Both will create a stir and arouse wide comment.

Mr. Wilson considers that "the war has reached a deadlock." If this opinion is born from the interviews which his ambassador has had recently with the German Emperor and Mr. von Bethmann-Hollweg, we will simply say that this opinion is one-sided. He adds: "When you cannot conquer, you must take counsel." It is precisely for this reason that the powers of the Entente do not ask and will not welcome the advice of any one.

Mr. Wilson, then, as in his recent interview, praises the neutrality of the United States, which he appears to present as proof of a moral superiority. It is here that he finds confronting him his illustrious predecessor, who in the name of the principles of morality severely reproves the present policy of his country.

Mr. Roosevelt has the right to speak as he does, and present circumstances have nothing whatever to do with his expressions. For years in all his writings and in all his speeches he has developed the maxim: "Neither a man who respects himself nor a nation which respects itself can submit to an injustice."

In advance of the present war he had made an application of this rule when in the lecture delivered by him at the Sorbonne in 1910 he declared: "If Peace and Justice were at odds, the nations would despise the man who would not place himself on the side of Justice." To which might be opposed the sentiment expressed by Mr. Wilson, "One may be too proud to fight."

Should, therefore, these two men appear as rival candidates at the next election the electorate would not complain of a lack of issues, since the two fundamental conceptions of national existence which they represent would be pitted one against the other. The jurist writes notes. The man of action points out duties. On one side utilitarian morality; on the other idealistic morality. On one side the policy of the least effort; on the other the policy of expansion. These are the two programmes face to face.

Our friends in the United States know well that it will never be from France that indiscreet tentatives of intervention in their internal affairs will emanate. We do not belong to the country of von Papen, and their choice, whatever it be, will always be respected by us. But official words have been pronounced, and the war which we now wage forms their subject. We may be forgiven, therefore, for pointing out some of the conclusions which may be derived from these public remarks.

The dilettanteism which Mr. Wilson affects towards the greatest conflict of forces and ideas which history has ever known has not been liked in France. After "Le Temps," M. Clemenceau in "L'Homme Enchaîné" and M. Herbette in "L'Echo de Paris," have pointed out how unjust and shocking this attitude has been to nations defending their liberty and their existence.

The Presidential speech which the telegraph now transmits to us is characterized by the same errors. It seems that Mr. Wilson thinks that his refusal to judge gives him the right to intervene. He is mistaken. To have tolerated the violation of Belgium's neutrality does not confer upon him the right to take part in the restoration of Belgium.

On a previous occasion we had hazarded the hypothesis that to justify his do-nothing policy Mr. Wilson possibly was inspired by a very narrow conception of the Monroe Doctrine. To-day we have the assurance from Americans that this is not so, and that in the opinion of Jefferson himself, "the essence of the Monroe Doctrine is a solemn protest against the atrocious violation of the right of nations through the intervention of one in the internal affairs of another."

Our eminent American confrere, Mr. Morton Fullerton, writing in the "Revue de Paris," on April 16, said: "If the President of the United States at the beginning of the war in 1914 had thought fit to do so, he could have based upon the Monroe Doctrine a protest against the violation by Germany of the neutrality of Belgium and Luxemburg, and the shades of Jefferson, Madison and Monroe would not have rebuked him."

It is a recognized fact that the United States has frequently shown that it knows how to intervene with force in questions of general interest. It went into China in 1900. At Algeciras it played the role of arbiter. It defended the Armenians against their murderers. If it had suited Mr. Wilson to act as the advocate for Belgium no principle whatever existed to stay him. He did not do so; this was his right as the ruler of a nation. But this right carries with it certain duties of which the simplest is not to meddle in 1916 in questions which he systematically ignored in 1914. To discover to-day that the war is inhuman when he has not protested against the inhumanity of aggression is, with the best intentions in the world, to arouse the suspicion of those who are fighting to defend themselves and who intend to fight to the bitter end.

Whether direct or indirect the appeals to peace will find us deaf for this good and sufficient reason. We believe that in renewing them Mr. Wilson—or any other ruler—would expose himself to a rebuff which it would be better to avoid. We have approved, because it was just and clear, the last note of the President on submarine warfare; but we have not supposed that in signing it Mr. Wilson intended merely to be agreeable to us. It did not create a bond between him and the Entente.

If we were to speak our whole mind we would say that we fear that Mr. Wilson, on the eve of the Presidential campaign, hopes to serve his own interests by offering himself to the voters as the pacificator of Europe. If this were true domestic politics would intrude indiscreetly into the domain of international politics. We doubt very much if this argument will impress the Americans, but it is our duty to point out its inconveniences from the point of view of the Entente nations.

The United States, through its best citizens, has showered us with proofs of esteem and affection, and we are sure of their sentiments towards us. Their government has observed a strict neutrality, and we have acknowledged the correctness of this attitude. Let us hope that this attitude will continue and that inopportune suggestions of a nature to serve our adversaries will not become the *leitmotif* of Presidential eloquence.

The Russians, who refused to betray the Serbians; the French, who remained faithful to the Russians; the Belgians, who refused to break their word, and the British, who rejected the outrageous bargain offered by Germany, are nations of the Roosevelt school. They have translated into deeds these words of the former President: "The good citizen must be brave and strong; that is to say, in a condition to serve his country by the force of arms if need be." Contrary to the teaching of the rival school, they have not been "too proud to fight."

That is why our Allies, like ourselves, have such an easy conscience and ears closed to all talk of conciliation. It is unnecessary to quote Scripture to recall us to a realization of justice, since it is justice that we are fighting for and it is we who are its soldiers.

To Promote a German Rebellion.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: As there are many persons in the United States who believe that a revolution in Germany and the overthrow of the Hohenzollern dynasty are the only means for obtaining world peace, application is now being made to the proper department of government for authorization to hold meetings and to raise funds to promote such rebellion in a technically "friendly" nation. They have been withheld from such efforts, which might be fruitful, through communication now practicable by secret means with discontented elements within the German Empire, on the presumption that they were illegal, but the allowance of such agitation in other and similar directions leads to the inference that this kind of agitation is permissible.

ERVING WINSLOW.

Boston, Mass., June 10, 1916.

BRITAIN AS AN ALLY

Why America Should Join Forces with Her Without Delay.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your correspondent Ivan Narodny is probably right in supposing that when the war closes "the role of leading the trend of civilization will belong wholly to the United States," but when he advises for us "a close alliance with Russia," I say why not ally ourselves with England? For she is now fighting our battle for national liberty and democratic government.

Also, it was England that made America English in speech and in law, also Protestant in religion, and implanted here ideals of freedom and liberty which are our most precious possessions. If we make such an alliance we shall—as one noted author puts it—only be declaring openly conditions which have long existed with mutual advantage to both countries.

Eighty per cent of our people doubtless favor the cause of the Entente Allies, and the aid we have already given them runs into the billions in value.

Dr. Johnson, of The Tribune, in his very able and timely history of "America's Foreign Relations" has shown clearly how much our people lack of appreciation, perspective and proportion in viewing other nations and their affairs, and thus have arisen many of our domestic and most of our external ills.

Now, as in 1775 and 1861, the door of destiny stands open for America, and she can no longer be self-centred or even neutral with any assurance of success or safety.

One of Columbia's professors in a letter to The Tribune lately said: "I think the United States ought to join the Allies rather than permit Germany to be victorious."

In 1823, when President Monroe issued his famous Monroe Doctrine, Jefferson wrote him advising an alliance with England, for, said he, "with Great Britain on our side we need not fear the whole world."

To-day such an alliance would aid us, psychologically and commercially, and give us something of a real international influence, and for her (if the Teutonic Allies should win a victory on the Continent sufficient to extort from the Allies terms of peace) it would mean the only sufficient means by which she could continue the struggle.

In spite of any theory of neutrality we of these United States are the ally or enemy of every nation on the globe, because American interests and American lives are everywhere in danger. In fact, the elimination of their interests from ours has become impossible. Theodore Roosevelt, that full-blooded American, struck the keynote when he declared that "opulent, aggressive and unprepared America invites aggression."

Why not, then, secure a helpful ally while we can?

J. C. PUMPELLY.

New York, June 10, 1916.

How to Get a Passport.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Will you kindly publish in your columns the following information, giving the necessary steps to secure a passport for France, as the information given by the State Department on this subject is incomplete, incorrect and confusing?

First—Get six photographs of yourself (3 by 3 inches), taken on thin paper.

Second—Get your birth certificate at your City Hall, if they register births.

Third—Get some one who can personally identify you at the office of your local United States District Court.

Fourth—Go to above office with above person and fill out forms of application for a passport and pay various fees amounting to about $5.

Fifth—Upon receipt of a letter from the State Department, Washington, advising that above application has been accepted, go to their branch office, 2 Rector Street, New York City (office hours, week days, 10 to 3; Saturdays, 9:30 to 12 o'clock), and get passport in person.

Sixth—Go to nearest office of a French consul and have them "viser" your passport.

Seventh—Do all the above things, allowing a margin of forty-eight hours before sailing in order to provide for emergencies and errors of the government clerks.

This may save persons wishing a passport for France some of the trouble I have been put to in getting mine, caused by ignorance of their duties on the part of the officials I have had to deal with.

EDWARD D. TOLAND.

Philadelphia, Penn., June 9, 1916.